

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING
September 1, 2011 UNION 205 3:30 pm

Present: Blakeslee, Carlin, Cates, Cauble, Condia, Honey, Lynn-Sherow, Smith, Soldan, Spriggs, Watts

Absent: Burenheide, Graham, Reed

Guest: Ed Rice

1. Bob Condia, chair, called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm and introduced new committee members.
2. The May 5, 2011 minutes were approved as submitted.
3. Visitor – Dr. Edward Rice, Associate V.P. Facilities
Discussion: Communication between KSU Facilities and Faculty

Condia thanked Dr. Rice for visiting FSCOUP and for supplying the peer reviews for their information. The peer reviews are not mandated, but having an outside group do a review in comparison to other universities was very beneficial. We have the oldest campus in terms of building's age and infrastructure in our peer database; we also have one of the oldest campuses in Sightlines' (a consulting group) system database from coast to coast.

Condia questioned and Rice clarified that Facilities' duties are taking care of maintaining existing buildings; constructing new buildings; running mail services; running the motor pool; and maintaining the campus grounds. Facilities are a catch all for services that have no home. This is quite a workload for their unit.

The premise of having this meeting is to actively work at promoting good communications between facilities and campus employees (in particular the constituents of the Faculty Senates). Rice noted that the peer review done by Sight Lines also indicated communication is one of the top needs.

The total budget for their unit is 30 million. Fifteen million is spent on utilities and salaries are about 14 million. That means there are a half a million dollars in funds for their operating budget, which is not much. R&R (rehabilitation and repair) that comes from the state is really what keeps things going, which is approximately 4.4 million. Next year that number should double because the crumbling classrooms bond will be paid off. We ought to be spending 17-18 million a year on repairs and maintenance, whereas we are spending 4.4. They got additional funds in recent years (one time) that will help put meters on all buildings. But it is evident that this very lack in being able to make repairs where needed can causes frustration campus wide.

Rice reported they are working to improve communications. For example, facilities have recently created a committee to review all work orders for each building. One of their goals is to become more accessible, paperless, and have the work orders available to view by those involved. There will be other focus areas as well for this committee. Currently they have about 200 projects on the books. Obviously there are many challenges to face.

Lynn-Sherow asked for a brief reconstruction of the financial history. Rice responded. It is now a common occurrence for universities to use the recharge system. In other words, when departments request work to be done by the university, they must pay for the labor and parts. This is where

complaints arise. Who sets the rates? Departments at times feel the charge for jobs is much higher than what they anticipate and therefore it makes it very difficult for them to plan ahead. A few options to help were discussed. There was also discussion over bids from outside. Even when a bid is given from an outside contractor, the project still has to go through the university planning office.

Lynn-Sherow commented that she and Ed came up with a form for privately-funded renovations. There was an original estimate form and then there was a secondary stage estimate. This worked well for its intended use. Perhaps something like this could be done for other jobs as well.

Rice suggested perhaps having members of this committee, along with others, review the facilities policies and procedures and see if there are areas that can use improvement or changes. FSCOUP members will take this task into consideration and likely effort.

Cauble went back to the need for better communication. This can help create more of a team atmosphere; which would go a long way in building up morale between facilities and campus employees. It seems now that departments are hesitant to call in part because of cost, but other factors come in to play such as delay and uncertainty as well.

As the conversation moved forward, Honey suggested that perhaps having a steward or authority (a gatekeeper so-to-speak) for specific buildings, or several buildings on campus, who could oversee what decisions are made for a building so that good decisions are made, planning can be done, and it can be in the best interest of the buildings and the campus. In other words there would be someone from facilities that is expert in particular structures. This suggestion was met with very good response. Perhaps this could be part of the K-State 2025 plan.

Do we have a guidebook for buildings on campus that are historic and what not? Lynn-Sherow has her own guide that she created for personal historic tours. A guide book of the campus and its buildings could engender a greater shared pride and knowledge of our place. Committee members discussed having that kind of a guide book timed to coincide with the sesquicentennial.

Condia thanked Rice for being willing to visit FSCOUP. He will arrange a follow-up when appropriate. Rice thanked committee members for their insight and suggestions and will continue to try to assist with improving communication between facilities and departments. Rice noted if there are people interested in being part of the committee working towards changes in the work orders to let him know. Condia suggested the committee look into the facilities manual to see if we can suggest changes worthy of instituting.

Cauble noted that at this juncture it seems prudent to make concrete suggestions to facilities that would be usable and which could be implemented without a lot of money, because none of us have the funds... this is a universal problem.

Various other comments and suggestions were made by committee members. Having students and others assist in helping take care of the campus was suggested. Spriggs noted that SGA helped last year in a clean-up day on campus and it was quite successful.

4. Marketing and Communication report - Jeffery Morris, Vice President - No report
5. Old Business:

1. Suggestions of FSCOUP's on priorities of K-State's 2025 logic models

Having a building steward to oversee what is done in a building to make sure a decision is made in the best interest of the building would be very appropriate.

6. New Business:

1. Nominations for "City/University Special Projects Fund Committee"

Condia noted that someone from FSCOUP typically sits on this committee. Three nominations need submitted to the city by October 24. Therefore, FSCOUP needs to put these nominations forward at the next meeting.

7. Announcements:

The Ad Hoc Master Campus Plan committee, initiated by the Provost, has begun its work and Condia will be serving on that as Faculty Senate's representative.

8. Meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm - Next meeting: October 6; 3:30 pm; Union Stateroom # 3

Guest: V.P. Bruce Shubert regarding Budget